

### **REMARKS**

Preliminarily, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the telephonic interview conducted on July 28, 2006. The substance of the interview is reflected in the remarks below.

Turning to the Office Action, claims 1-26 have been examined, with all claims rejected. Claims 1, 2, 14, and 15 remain rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Reichmeyer (U.S. Patent No. 6,286,038), and claims 3-13 and 16-26 remain rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichmeyer in view of Kung et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,267).

Applicant continues to traverse the rejection for the same reasons asserted in the previous Response dated December 8, 2005. These assertions are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety.

While not conceding the validity of the rejections, but merely to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to address comments made by the Examiner during the telephone interview. That is, applicant has amended the claims to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from a general computer system. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the prior art rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By *Laura C. Brutman*  
Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant